## COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY

## BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

\* \* \* \* \*

In the Matter of:

Andrew Co

THE TARIFF FILING OF AT&T )
COMMUNICATIONS CONCERNING ) CASE NO. 9080
THE PROVISION OF ACCUNET )
T1.5 SERVICE )

## ORDER

On May 17, 1984, AT&T Communications ("AT&T") filed a proposed tariff which would allow provision of Accunet T1.5 Service. On June 15, 1984, the Commission issued an Order suspending the proposed tariff for 5 months from the proposed effective date of June 18, 1984, to allow further investigation into the reasonableness of the proposed tariff.

On May 29, 1984, the Commission requested that AT&T submit cost documentation for the proposed tariff. AT&T responded verbally that no cost information was available.

On July 2, 1984, the Commission issued an Order requesting cost documentation for the establishment of ACCUNET T1.5 Service. AT&T responded on July 20, 1984, by furnishing a copy of the summary of projected revenues, expenses and investments for the 12-month period ending December 31, 1984, on a nationwide basis. AT&T further informed the Commission that this information was not available for Kentucky only.

An informal conference was held on August 30, 1984, with representatives of AT&T, the Attorney General's Office and Commission staff attending. AT&T representatives indicated that more accurate data related to the cost of the provision of the service within Kentucky could not be provided. They indicated that a similar filing had been made with the Federal Communications Commission ("FCC") but had not been accepted. A non-binding agreement was reached to await the action of the FCC in that filing. On September 5, 1984, the Attorney General filed a motion to intervene in this proceeding.

AT&T further agreed to inform the Commission of any action that was taken by the FCC. As of this date, AT&T has not informed this Commission of any action taken by the FCC.

The Commission, after consideration of the evidence of record and being advised, is of the opinion that:

- No Kentucky-specific cost data was provided to justify the proposed tariff.
- 2. The proposed rates are lower than those for a like service offered on an intraLATA basis by South Central Bell Telephone Company in the same area.
- 3. The proposed tariff does not specify certain charges; instead it indicates that Local Exchange Company charges for access will be directly transferred to the customer, thereby effecting a pass-through of costs.

4. AT&T has failed to furnish proper cost documentation in support of the proposed tariff and has provided no documentation of any subsequent FCC action following the informal conference.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the proposed tariff be and it hereby is denied. The pages of the tariff application hereby denied are:

Tariff D - Original Pages:

D1 Title Page, Contents Page, Page 1

D2 Pages 1-22

D3 Pages 1-16

D4 Page 1

Done at Frankfort, Kentucky, this 16th day of November,

1984.

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Chairman

Vice Chairman

Tuck

ATTEST:

Secretary